

1
2
3
4 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
5 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
6 **SAN JOSE DIVISION**
7

8 KUANG-BAO PAUL OU-YOUNG,

9 Plaintiff,

10 v.

11 COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA, et al.,

12 Defendants.
13

Case No. 21-cv-07361-BLF

**ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY
CASE SHOULD NOT BE DISMISSED
FOR FAILURE TO EFFECT SERVICE
OF PROCESS**

14 Plaintiff Kuang-Bao Paul Ou-Young filed this action on September 22, 2021. *See* Compl.,
15 ECF 2. “If a defendant is not served within 90 days after the complaint is filed, the court – on
16 motion or on its own after notice to the plaintiff – must dismiss the action without prejudice
17 against that defendant or order that service be made within a specified time.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m).
18 More than 90 days have elapsed and Plaintiff has not filed proof of service of process on any of
19 the Defendants. Accordingly, Plaintiff is ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE, in writing and on or
20 before January 21, 2022, why this case should not be dismissed without prejudice under Rule
21 4(m).

22 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**
23

24 Dated: January 7, 2022

25 

26 BETH LABSON FREEMAN
27 United States District Judge
28